



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/735,451	12/12/2003	Randall Fuerst		2007
7590 CONN. ANALYTICAL CORP. Att: Joseph J. Bango, Jr. 696 AMITY ROAD BETHANY, CT 06524			EXAMINER VARGOT, MATHIEU D	
			ART UNIT 1732	PAPER NUMBER
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
30 DAYS	04/17/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

10/735, 451

EXAMINER

M. VARGOT

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

1732 20070325

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply filed on January 5, 2007 is not fully responsive to the prior Office Action because of the following omission(s) or matter(s): Applicant has amended the claims extensively, yet there is no indication of where the support for many of these amendments occurs. For instance, paragraphs (c) and (g) added to claim 1 and new claims 13 and 14 do not appear to be supported by the specification as originally filed. The same for the size of the fibers in new claim 10, some of the materials listed in new claim 11, and the prescriptive surface of claim 12. Also, there is no indication that the control of the mean fibril distance as recited in new claim 6 is related to forming a pattern that exceeds the perimeter of the lens. Instead of showing where support exists, applicant submits that the examiner has used hindsight to reject the claims. However, it should be noted that simply adding limitations to claims that are not supported by the original specification is not sufficient to overcome an obviousness rejection. It is also not clear from the response whether applicant believes that the claims as originally presented were obvious but the instant are not. Given that support cannot be found for the instant claims, the response is submitted as being non-responsive to the previous rejection. See 37 CFR 1.111. Since the above-mentioned reply appears to be bona fide, applicant is given ONE (1) MONTH or THIRTY (30) DAYS from the mailing date of this notice, whichever is longer, within which to supply the omission or correction in order to avoid abandonment. EXTENSIONS OF THIS TIME PERIOD MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136(a)

Mathieu D. Vargot
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1732

3/26/07